

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-14, 17, 19-21, and 58-70 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 57 and 66-72 are independent claims. Claim 3, 5-6, 15-16, 18, 22-39 and 48-56 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 40-47 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 62-72 are added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-26, 28, 30-35, 37, 39-52, 54 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112789 to Heinonen et al. (hereinafter “Heinonen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,232 to Hasty, Jr. et al. (hereinafter “Hasty”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,380 to Norefors et al. (hereinafter “Norefors”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the combination of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors does not teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in the pending claims, and newly added claims 58-70. Independent of claims 1, 12, 57 and 70, in part, recite “transmitting instructions to the mobile device, the instructions including a hashed code comprising the code associated with the mobile device and the wide area identification, wherein the instructions are to direct the mobile device to forward the hashed code to the access point in a subsequent request for service from the network server, after the mobile device leaves the coverage area, to enable the access point to associate a current session between the network server and the access point with the subsequent request.”

Claims 68-69 and 71-72, in part, recite “receiving instructions from the access point, the instructions including a hashed code comprising the code associated with the mobile device and the wide area identification, wherein the instructions are to direct the mobile device to forward the hashed code to the access point in a subsequent request for service from a network server, after the mobile device leaves the coverage area, to enable the access point to associate a current session between the network server and the access point with the subsequent request.”

The combination of Heinonen and Hasty does not teach or suggest these features.

Therefore, the Office Action cited Norefors to cure these deficiencies. However, Norefors does not cure any of the deficiencies of Heinonen or Hasty. The cited section of Norefors merely discloses that a message, including an encrypted security token and hash code, is transmitted to a mobile node where it is deciphered and re-encrypted with another encryption key. The second encryption key is shared by the mobile node and a second access point. The re-encrypted message is sent from the mobile node to the second access point where it is deciphered using the shared encryption key. A communications link is established between the mobile node and the second access point to achieve a secure handover, if the second access point authenticates the mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. See at least Col. 2, lines 17-37 of Norefors.

In the Response to Argument section, the Office Action alleged that the handover request to the second access point in Norefors reads on the subsequent service, as recited in the pending claims. In Norefors, the handover request is from the mobile node to the second access point. As noted above, the pending claims, in part, recite that “the instructions are to direct the mobile device to forward the hashed code to the access point in a subsequent request for service from the network server, after the mobile device leaves the coverage area.” (underlining added) There is no teaching or suggestion in Norefors of sending the handover request back to the first access point that sent the instructions to the mobile node. Instead, in Norefors, the handover request is sent to a different/second access point and handover occurs if the second access point authenticates the mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Norefors of instructions “to direct the mobile device to forward the hashed code to the access point in a subsequent request for service from the network server, after the mobile device leaves the coverage area,” as recited in the pending claims.

As is known to one skilled in the art, handover or handoff, as discussed in Norefors, is the transition of the mobile node from one access point or base station to another access point or base station as the mobile node moves around. Thus, handover is performed to prevent call termination as the mobile node moves around. In the pending claims, “the instructions are to direct the mobile device to forward the hashed code to the access point in a subsequent request for service from the network server, after the mobile device leaves the coverage area, to enable the access point to associate a current session between the network server and the access point

with the subsequent request.” There is no teaching or suggestion of sending a hashed code to the first access point in a request of service from the second access point/another provider to enable the first access point to associate the request with a current session between the first access point and the second access point/provider. Therefore, the subsequent request for service, as recited in the pending claims, is not equivalent to the handover as disclosed in Norefors.

Based on the distinctions noted above, the combination of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors fails to teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 1, 12, 57 and 68-72. Each of pending claims 2, 4, 7-11, 13-14, 17, 19-21, and 58-67 depends on claims 1 and 12, and therefore, incorporates all of the elements of claims 1 and 12 in addition to the further limitations recited in claims 2, 4, 7-11, 13-14, 17, 19-21, and 58-67. Hence, pending claims 2, 4, 7-11, 13-14, 17, 19-21, and 58-67 are also allowable at least because of their dependence on claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-26, 28, 30-35, 37, 39-52, 54 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Claims 27, 36 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen and Hasty in view of Norefors, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046184 to Bjorklund et al. (hereinafter “Bjorklund”). Claims 29, 38 and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen and Hasty in view of Norefors, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0127204 to Belmont (hereinafter “Belmont”). Claims 27, 29, 36, 38, 53, and 55 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 27, 29, 36, 38, 53, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-00449-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 18, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Arlene Neal/
Arlene Neal

Registration No.: 43,828
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant